

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the careful examination of the application, and for the suggestions for amending the application. However, in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections.

35 U.S.C. §101:

In accordance with the suggestion from the Examiner, the preambles of claims 8 and 15 have been amended to recite a computer readable medium. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 8 and 15 based on 35 U.S.C. §101.

Art Rejections:

Claims 1-3 and 5-8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,825,942, hereinafter Miyaza, in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0114804, hereinafter Tanioka. In response to the rejections set forth by the Examiner, independent claims 1, 7, and 8 have been carefully amended to more clearly distinguish the claim language from the applied prior art. The subject matter added to the claims is supported in Figures 6, 8, and 9 of the present application. See also paragraphs 0048 through 0054 of the published application.

As now amended, each of claims 1, 7, and 8 recite a process by which the selector first selects a font data of a first size based on the character codes recognized by the code recognizer, the font point size recognized by the size recognizer, and the magnification set by the setter. The selector then determines if the font data of a second particular point size should be used instead of the font data

of the first particular point size based on the size of the region of the character image in the enlarged or reduced image data.

In the preferred exemplary embodiment, the first particular point size is illustrated in the middle section of Figure 8, wherein it can be seen that the text exceeds the circumscribing rectangle. Accordingly, as can be seen the third portion of Figure 8, the font size has been corrected to a smaller size. However, the present invention is not limited to the illustrated preferred embodiment.

Applicants submit that the combination that includes this feature is not taught by Miyaza and/or Tanioka, either individually or collectively. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 1-3 and 5-8 based on Miyaza and Tanioka be withdrawn.

Claims 9-15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyaza in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,243,549, hereinafter Ando.

In response to that rejection, independent claims 9, 14, and 15 have been amended to carefully distinguish the subject matter therein from the applied prior art. Specifically, the claims now recite that, in the reconstructed layout, at least one of a shape of each character region and a start point of a new line of each character region may be changed. Support for the amendments may be found in paragraph 0067 and Figures 15A and 15B of the published application. However, the present invention is not limited to the illustrated preferred embodiment.

Applicants submit that neither Miyaza, nor Ando, teaches or suggests the combination set forth in claims 9-15, and in particular, wherein in the reconstructed layout, at least one of a shape of each character region and the start point of a new line of each character region may be changed.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 9-15 based on Miyaza and Ando.

Claim 28 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Ando in view of Miyaza. In order to more clearly distinguish claim 28 from the applied prior art, claim 28 has been amended to clarify that the setter sets at least one magnification based on a sum of all of the areas of images on the end pages. Support for the Amendment to claim 28 may be found at least at paragraphs 0075 through 0083 and Figures 19 and 21 of the published application. That feature is also not taught by the applied prior art. Accordingly, claim 28 is also patentable over the applied prior art.

Claims 16-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyaza and Tanioka as applied to claims 1, 7, and 8 above, and further in view of IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin. However, claims 16, 17, and 18 depend from claims 1, 7, and 8, respectively. As set forth above, claims 1, 7, and 8 have been carefully amended to distinguish over the applied prior art. As now forth in the independent claims, a first particular point size is selected based on the recognized character codes, the font point size recognized by the size recognizer, and the magnification set by the setter. It is the selected or calculated first point size that is compared to make the determination as to whether a second particular point size should be selected instead of the first particular point size. In the IBM Technical Bulletin, it is the width of the recognized data that is compared to another width to determine if an adjustment is necessary. In other words, the IBM Technical Bulletin does not teach or suggest first calculating a first particular point size based on the

recognized data and then comparing the calculated first particular point size to make a determination. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 16-18 should be withdrawn.

Claims 19-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyaza and Ando and further in view of Tanioka and the IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin. However, claims 19-21 are dependent claims which depend from claims 9, 14, and 15. The amendments to claims 9, 14, and 15 have been discussed above. Since Tanioka and the IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin do not overcome the deficiencies of Miyaza and Ando with respect to the independent claims, the rejection of claims 19-21 should be withdrawn.

Claim 4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyaza and Tanioka, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,533,174, hereinafter Flowers. However, claim 4 depends from amended claim 1, and Flowers is relied upon for allegedly disclosing a communication section which communicates with an external apparatus, wherein the selector selects the compatible font data from among a plurality of font data stored in the external apparatus. Thus, the teachings in Flowers relied upon by the Examiner do not overcome the deficiency of the rejection of claim 1, as set forth above.

Applicants reserve the rights to challenge the Examiner's interpretation or description of any of the references described in the Official Action and/or the Examiner's stated reasons or motivation for combining the references in the manner set forth in the Official Action, at a later time, if necessary and appropriate.

Accordingly, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections.

In the event that there are any issues further outstanding, the Examiner is respectfully encouraged to telephone the undersigned attorney so that prosecution of the application may be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: June 21, 2007

By: S.D. Boone Reg No. 57,635

William C. Rowland
Registration No. 30888

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620